



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

DARREN GRETLER
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

Statement of Reasons for Exemption from Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15183

Date: September 3, 2015
Project Title: Lone Oak TM and MUP
Record ID: PDS2014-TM-5585; PDS2014-MUP-14-017; LOG NO. PDS2014-ER-14-08-006
Plan Area: North County Metro
GP Designation: VR-2
Density: 2-units per acre
Zoning: Limited Agriculture (A70) and Rural Residential (RR)
Min. Lot Size: 0.5 acre
Special Area Reg.: N/A
Lot Size: 0.05 – 3.95 acres with a Planned Development Major Use Permit
Applicant: Marc Perlman, Marker Lone Oak, LLC (858) 755-3350
Staff Contact: Michael Johnson - (858) 694-3429
Michael.Johnson1@sdcounty.ca.gov

Project Description

The project is a Tentative Map and Major Use Permit for a Planned Development to subdivide a 14.15-acre property into 24 residential lots and 6 non-buildable lots (lots comprised of private road easements, water quality detention basins, slopes, and open space). The site is located at 1535 Lone Oak Road in the North County Metro Community Plan Area. Access to the site would be provided by a private road connecting to Lone Oak Road as well as Cleveland Trail. Improvements are proposed to Lone Oak Road and Cleveland Trail as part of the project (as shown on the preliminary grading plan and TM). Water will be provided by the Vista Irrigation District and sewer would be provided by the Buena Sanitation District. Earthwork will consist of approximately 73,850 cubic yards of cut and fill.

The site is subject to the Village Residential VR-2 General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation Village. Zoning for the site is A70 (Limited Agriculture) and RR (Rural Residential). Additionally, the project proposes a Planned Development pursuant to Section 6600 through 6699 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Planned Development allows for a Major Use Permit to set the minimum lot size and setbacks as long as the project complies the maximum density provisions of the General Plan and complies with the Planned Development requirements. The project is consistent with density the and lot size requirements of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Overview

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

General Plan Update Program EIR

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The GPU applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and directs population growth and plans for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The GPU included adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. It also included a corresponding land use map, a County Road Network map, updates to Community and Subregional Plans, an Implementation Plan, and other implementing policies and ordinances. The GPU focuses population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA service area covers approximately the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the GPU.

The GPU EIR was certified in conjunction with adoption of the GPU on August 3, 2011. The GPU EIR comprehensively evaluated environmental impacts that would result from Plan implementation, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts.

Summary of Findings

The Lone Oak Planned Development; PDS2014-TM-5585 and PDS2014-MUP-14-017; is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures (see http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_-_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the project qualifies for an exemption because the following findings can be made:

- 1. The project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.**
The project would subdivide a 14.15-acre property into 24 residential lots, which is consistent with the VR-2 development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.
- 2. There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.**
The subject property is no different than other properties in the surrounding area, and there are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The site is located in an area developed with similarly sized, estate residential lots with associated accessory uses. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the project would not result in any peculiar effects.

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The project could result in potentially significant impacts to Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Noise and Traffic. However, applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.
- 3. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.**
The proposed project is consistent with the density and use characteristics of the development considered by the GPU EIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for build-out of the General Plan. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.
- 4. There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.**
As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, no new information has been identified which would result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.
- 5. The project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR.**
As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, the project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR. These GPU EIR mitigation measures will be undertaken through project design, compliance with regulations and ordinances, or through the project's conditions of approval.

 9/3/15
Signature Date

Michael Johnson **Project Manager**
Printed Name Title

CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist

Overview

This checklist provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Following the format of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, environmental effects are evaluated to determine if the project would result in a potentially significant impact triggering additional review under Guidelines section 15183.

- Items checked “Significant Project Impact” indicates that the project could result in a significant effect which either requires mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level or which has a significant, unmitigated impact.
- Items checked “Impact not identified by GPU EIR” indicates the project would result in a project specific significant impact (peculiar off-site or cumulative that was not identified in the GPU EIR.
- Items checked “Substantial New Information” indicates that there is new information which leads to a determination that a project impact is more severe than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

A project does not qualify for a §15183 exemption if it is determined that it would result in: 1) a peculiar impact that was not identified as a significant impact under the GPU EIR; 2) a more severe impact due to new information; or 3) a potentially significant off-site impact or cumulative impact not discussed in the GPU EIR.

A summary of staff’s analysis of each potential environmental effect is provided below the checklist for each subject area. A list of references, significance guidelines, and technical studies used to support the analysis is attached in Appendix A. Appendix B contains a list of GPU EIR mitigation measures.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
1. AESTHETICS – Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 1(a) Based on a site visit completed by County staff Michael Johnson, the proposed project is located near the viewshed of a scenic vista. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying land cover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The visual environment of the subject scenic vista is located to the east and consists of a group of visually prominent undeveloped hillsides covered with native vegetation. The project proposes Tentative Map and Major Use Permit for a Planned Development to divide a 14.15-acre property into 24 residential lots and 6 non-buildable lots (lots comprised of private road easements, water quality detention basins, slopes, and open space). The project is compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality because: 1) The surrounding area is comprised of single-family residences similar to the proposed project; 2) The project includes a landscape plan that includes Strawberry, Brisbane Box, Southern Magnolia, Fern Pine, Western Redbud, Grape Myrtle, California Sycamore, Coast Live Oak, and African Sumac planted throughout the project site to help shield views of the proposed project; 3) The project will retain mature trees along the western and southern project boundary to help further camouflage the development; 4) The project only proposes single story houses along the southern project boundary, where the development will abut existing houses; and 5) The project includes a minimum 25-40' setback from the western and southern property lines, a 50' setback from the centerline of Cleveland Trail, and a large open space easement and detention basins between the proposed structures and Buena Creek Road and Lone Oak Road. Also, a Consistency Analysis was prepared by Hunsaker and Associates dated June 2015 that indicated the lot area averaging proposed by the Planned Development was consistent with the surrounding area because the surrounding area already contains lots of 0.5 acre or less in size. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- 1(b) The property is not within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property.
- 1(c) The project would be consistent with existing visual and community character. The project is located at the northeast intersection of Buena Creek Road and Lone Oak Road in an area characterized by mostly single-family and agricultural uses. The addition of

24 new residential lots would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings. Additionally, the project includes the following design measures that will shield some views of the project and ensure that the surrounding community character is maintained: 1) The project includes a landscape plan that includes Strawberry, Brisbane Box, Southern Magnolia, Fern Pine, Western Redbud, Grape Myrtle, California Sycamore, Coast Live Oak, and African Sumac planted throughout the project site to help shield views of the proposed project; 2) The project will retain mature trees along the western and southern project boundary to help further camouflage the development; 3) The project only proposes single story houses along the southern project boundary, where the development will abut existing houses; and 4) The project includes a minimum 25-40' setback from the western and southern property lines, a 50' setback from the centerline of Cleveland Trail, and a large open space easement and detention basins between the proposed structures and Buena Creek Road and Lone Oak Road. Also, a Consistency Analysis was prepared by Hunsaker and Associates dated June 2015 that indicated the lot area averaging proposed by the Planned Development was consistent with the surrounding area because the surrounding area already contains lots of 0.5 acre or less in size. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on the existing visual character.

- 1(d) Residential lighting would be required to conform with the County’s Light Pollution Code to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties and minimize impacts to dark skies.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to aesthetics; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources			
– Would the Project:			
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

Discussion

2(a) The project does not support any Farmland of Local Importance, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site is designated as “Other Land”. However, the site is considered an agricultural resource because it has contained agricultural uses in the past and contains Statewide Significance Soils (Huerhuero loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes, eroded and Wyman loam, 5 to 9 percent slope) and Prime Farmland Soils (Greenfield sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes). Due to the presence of onsite agricultural resources, an Agricultural Analysis dated April 2015 was completed by Shawn Shamlou of Dudek based on the County’s Local Agricultural Resources Assessment (LARA) model, which takes into account local factors that define the importance of San Diego County agricultural resources. The LARA model considers the availability of water resources, climate, soil quality, surrounding land use, topography, and land use or parcel size consistency between the project site and surrounding land uses. A more detailed discussion of the LARA model can be found in the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources at <http://www.sdcdplu.org/dplu/Resource/docs/3~pdf/AG-Guidelines.pdf>.

In order for a site to be considered an important agricultural resource based on the LARA model, all three required LARA model factors (water, soil, and climate) must receive either a high or moderate score. A low score in any of these three categories would render a LARA model result that the site is not an important agricultural resource. Based on the onsite soils, climate and availability of water, the Agricultural Analysis determined that the site is considered an important agricultural resource.

To mitigate for impacts to agricultural resources, as defined by the Agricultural Resource Guidelines for Determining Significance, mitigation shall be acquired at a 1:1 ratio. The project is required to mitigate for any land that was historically used for agriculture and is currently on available soils that is going to be impacted by the project (See figure 7 of the Agricultural Analysis for the portion of this project that meets these requirements). The project will be conditioned to mitigate for 3.38 acres of direct impacts through the County of San Diego’s Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement (PACE) program prior to issuance of any permit per mitigation measures MM AG-1 referenced in the projects Agricultural Analysis. This condition is consistent with Mitigation measure Agr-1.4 from the GPU EIR. Direct impacts to Agricultural Resources are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

- 2(b) The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract or agriculturally zoned land.
- 2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the property.
- 2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands.
- 2(e) The project site is adjacent to Farmland of Statewide Importance and Prime Farmland as shown on the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and active agricultural production areas. However, as discussed in the Agricultural Analysis, dated April 2015, prepared by Shawn Shamlou of Dudek on file with Planning & Development Services as Environmental Review Number PDS2014-ER-14-08-006 the project will not

result in the potentially significant conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance for the following reasons:

- The closest active agricultural operations are located several hundred feet from the site.
- The small agricultural operations in the surrounding area are composed primarily of palm tree groves on large-lot properties with single-family residences. The proposed project would not impact these operations because there are existing houses and roads located between the operation and the proposed project site. These small agricultural operations are currently surrounded by large-lot single-family residential units and development would be compatible with the surrounding agricultural uses, as palm tree groves do not utilize consistent loud machinery or create off-putting odor.
- The project site has a standard front-yard setback of 60 feet, interior side-yard setback of 15 feet, exterior side-yard setback of 35 feet, and rear-yard setback of 25 and 50 feet from the external boundary of the subdivision. The open space wetland/woodland lot includes an undisturbed 50-foot oak root buffer, which will extend approximately 700 feet along the western side of the project site. Residential structures will be required to be set back an additional 50 feet from this oak root buffer. This buffer area would create a larger setback from surrounding uses.
- The existing fence and numerous mature trees along the southern perimeter will remain in place and will provide another barrier to surrounding uses.
- The adjacent agricultural operations are located on single-family properties and are surrounded by residences that do not engage in agriculture. These agricultural operations have coexisted with residential land uses surrounding the operations for over 20 years.
- The agricultural operation to the south of the project site has a circular driveway surrounding the tree crops as well as tall trees and shrubbery. These objects create a buffer that will help to prevent trespassing, theft, or vandalism from occurring.
- The agricultural operation to the west is on a large property surrounded by fields of fallow agriculture and is separated from the project site by a number of roads and dozens of residences. These barriers would ensure that the proposed project would not be a source of vectors or pests.
- There are no areas under a Williamson Act Contract within 1/4 mile.
- In addition to the small agricultural operations in the surrounding area, there is an active apiary located on the property east of the project site. In order to prevent incompatibility with the proposed project, notification to the property owner prior to construction shall be required (see MM AG-2 within the Agricultural Analysis). In addition, in the event that construction crews notice aggressive bee behavior during grading and construction, construction work would stop and the County of San Diego Agricultural Weights and Measures shall be notified immediately (See MM AG-3 within the Agricultural analysis).

As mentioned in Section 2(a) above, the project would be required mitigate for 3.38 acres of direct impacts through the County of San Diego's PACE program for direct impacts to onsite agricultural resources.

Also, Mitigation measures AG-2 and AG-3 mentioned above are consistent with the GPU EIR Agr-1.2 mitigation measure. Among other things, this measure states that the County shall develop and implement programs/regulations that protect agricultural lands (such as CEQA Guidelines). The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining

Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Agricultural Resources states in section 5.2.1 that project design elements should be considered that would eliminate the potential conflict to off-site agricultural resources. These mitigation measures are also consistent with General Plan Policy COS-6.2, which requires that development minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations through the incorporation of adequate buffers, setbacks, and project design measures to protect surrounding agriculture.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to agricultural resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
3. Air Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

3(a) The applicant proposes development that was anticipated and considered by SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions

from the project are below screening levels, and will not violate any ambient air quality standards.

- 3(b) The project proposes the construction of 24 single family homes. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the Grading Ordinance and San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rule 55-Fugitive Dust Control, which require the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening level criteria established by County air quality guidelines for determining significance. Further, all off-road construction equipment would use U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved Tier 2 engines and would be equipped with CARB-approved diesel particulate filters. Tier 2 engines reduce emissions of NOx and diesel particulate filters reduce diesel exhaust emissions. In addition, the project would result in operational vehicle trips associated with the proposed land uses. However, as shown in the air quality study conducted for the project, operational-related emissions would not exceed County screening levels (Air Quality Assessment dated August 27, 2015).
- 3(c) The project would contribute PM10, NOx, and VOCs emissions from construction/grading and operational activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening thresholds (see question 3(b) above). Further, as described above, construction equipment would be equipped with U.S. EPA Tier 2 engines and diesel particulate filters, further reducing exhaust emissions.
- 3(d) The proposed Project would develop 24 single-family residential units, but would not include any of the types of uses that have been identified as sources of air pollution by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). In addition, the Project would not place sensitive receptors within the CARB siting distances of the listed air pollutant sources. Further, Project emissions of PM10 and PM2.5 during operation would be below screening level thresholds (Air Quality Assessment dated August 27, 2015). Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near any carbon monoxide hotspots.
- 3(e) The project could produce objectionable odors during construction and would not result in any permanent odor sources associated with operations. Odorous emissions disperse rapidly with increasing distance from the source and due to the small scale of construction activities, emissions would be minimal and temporary, ceasing once construction is complete. Therefore, construction related odors would not result in a new odor source that could adversely affect a substantial number of individuals. The Project would not place sensitive receptors within a close proximity to known odor sources. In addition, the residential development would not be a source of odors, as the operation of residential uses are not generally associated with odors. Impacts associated with odor sources are considered less than significant.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to air quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:			
Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

4(a) Biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a Biological Resources Letter Report prepared by Dudek, dated February 2015. The northwest portion of the project site supports sensitive vegetation communities, including coast live oak woodland, freshwater marsh, disturbed southern coast live oak riparian forest, and non-native grassland; the remainder of the site contains non-native woodland, extensive agriculture, and disturbed/developed habitat. Directed surveys and habitat assessments were conducted on site for sensitive species considered endangered, rare, or threatened. Five special-status plant species have a moderate potential to occur within the project site; however, none were identified on site during the rare plant survey. One special-status wildlife species, red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*) was observed calling in the project area. There is moderate potential for 21 wildlife species to occur on site during some stage of their life cycle (e.g., foraging, migration, or breeding), and a high potential for two wildlife species (turkey vulture [*Cathartes aura*] and yellow warbler [*Setophaga*

petechial brewsteri) occur on site; however, none were observed during surveys. The special-status wildlife with moderate or high potential to occur on site would primarily be associated with the riparian woodland or freshwater marsh associated with Buena Creek, outside of the proposed project impact area; therefore, no direct impacts to these species are anticipated. Potential short-term indirect impacts to biological resources related to project construction (e.g., dust, noise, general human presence, and construction-related soil erosion and runoff) and long-term indirect effects (e.g., introduction of non-native species, lighting, increased human presence, pets, and traffic) would be significant.

As considered by the GPU EIR, project impacts to sensitive habitat and/or species will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of project-specific mitigation measures. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Bio-1.6 and Bio-1.7. Project-specific mitigation includes on-site preservation of 0.20 acre of non-native grassland, purchase of 1.32 acres of oak woodland habitat within the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank, biological monitoring and special care within excavated areas during construction to avoid impacts to wildlife, construction of permanent fencing and application of a limited building zone along the proposed open space lot to protect sensitive biological resources, use of the appropriate plant palette for landscaping, and breeding season avoidance.

- 4(b) A jurisdictional delineation conducted as part of the Biological Resources Letter Report (Dudek 2015) identified Buena Creek and associated freshwater marsh habitat as County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) resources. Within the project site, approximately 0.20 acre of unvegetated stream channel in Buena Creek is considered non-wetland waters and 0.11 acre of freshwater marsh is considered a wetland. These resources are under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the County. Based on the County RPO guidelines, an RPO wetland buffer was established to avoid direct impacts to the RPO resources. The RPO wetland buffer includes the adjacent disturbed southern coast live oak riparian forest, as well as a 50-foot buffer from the freshwater marsh habitat.

In addition to GPU EIR mitigation measures Bio-1.6 and Bio-1.7 noted above, the GPU EIR identified mitigation measures Bio-2.2, Bio-2.3, and Bio-2.4 to reduce direct and indirect project impacts to riparian and other sensitive habitats. As detailed in response a) above, direct and indirect impacts to sensitive habitats and wildlife would be mitigated through implementation of on-site habitat preservation and off-site habitat purchases, as well as construction of fencing and application of a limited building zone along the proposed open space lot and use of the appropriate plant palette for landscaping. Therefore, project impacts to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities identified in the County Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), County RPO, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations, are considered less than significant.

- 4(c) The project site contains freshwater marsh habitat that is considered federally protected wetland defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project has been determined by County staff to be in compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, per the jurisdictional delineation conducted as part of the Biological Resources Letter Report. Wetlands defined under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act present within the project site would be completely protected within the proposed open space lot with an

appropriate wetland buffer. No direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion, or obstruction of these resources would occur with the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the ACOE.

- 4(d) The project site likely functions as a local wildlife corridor as it connects to undeveloped land east and southwest of the site and includes a portion of Buena Creek. The proposed open space lot along the creek would maintain this area as a corridor for local wildlife movement. As such, impacts to wildlife movement corridors are considered to be less than significant.
- 4(e) Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, including Habitat Management Plans, Special Area Management Plans, or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including the MSCP, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, RPO, and Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

- 5. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
- 6. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
- 7. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
- 8. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 5(a) Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County approved archaeologist, Micah Hale, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in the cultural resources report titled, Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Lone Oak Road Project, San Diego County, California (October 2014) prepared by Brad Comeau and Micah Hale.
- 5(b) No archaeological resources were found on the property during the archaeological survey. Both the Project Archaeologist and County staff contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for a listing of Native American Tribes whose ancestral lands may be impacted by the project. The NAHC response indicated that no Native American cultural resources, on record with the commission, were present on the project property. Responses were received from Pala, Pechanga, Rincon, and San Luis Rey. Pala and Rincon requested to be kept updated as the project progresses. San Luis Rey (SLR) requested a copy of the cultural study and met with County staff. SLR is satisfied with the requirement for an Archaeological Monitoring program. Pechanga requested additional information (geology study, off-site improvements, depth of prior mass grading, grading/development plans, and archaeological study). All requested information has been provided to Pechanga.

Regional coordination and consultation is identified in the GPU EIR as mitigation measures CUL-2.2, CUL-2.4, and CUL-2.6. Shelly Nelson (La Jolla Band of Mission Indians) of Saving Sacred Sites was a part of the survey crew engaged as the Native American monitor.

Although no resources were identified during site surveys, the potential exists for subsurface deposits. As such, an archaeological monitoring program is required. As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through compliance with the Grading Ordinance and through conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The archaeological monitoring program (CUL-2.5) will include the following requirements:

- Pre-Construction
 - Pre-construction meeting to be attended by the Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay Native American monitor to explain the monitoring requirements.
- Construction
 - Monitoring. Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor are to be onsite during earth disturbing activities. The frequency and location of monitoring of native soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor. Monitoring of previously disturbed soils will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor.
 - If cultural resources are identified:
 - Both the Project Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American monitor have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of the discovery.
 - The Project Archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist.

- The Project Archaeologist in consultation with the County Archaeologist and Luiseno Native American shall determine the significance of discovered resources.
- Construction activities will be allowed to resume after the County Archaeologist has concurred with the significance evaluation.
- Isolates and non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. Should the isolates and non-significant deposits not be collected by the Project Archaeologist, the Luiseno Native American monitor may collect the cultural material for transfer to a Tribal curation facility or repatriation program.
- If cultural resources are determined to be significant, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Luiseno Native American monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist. The program shall include reasonable efforts to preserve (avoid) unique cultural resources or Sacred Sites; the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and placement of development over the cap if avoidance is infeasible; and data recovery for non-unique cultural resources. The preferred option is preservation (avoidance).
- Human Remains.
 - The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
 - Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin.
 - If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), shall be contacted by the Property Owner or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
 - The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
 - Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.
- Rough Grading
 - Upon completion of Rough Grading, a monitoring report shall be prepared identifying whether resources were encountered.
- Final Grading
 - A final report shall be prepared substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and whether cultural resources were encountered.
 - Disposition of Cultural Material.
 - The final report shall include evidence that all prehistoric materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility or Tribal curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 or

alternatively that the prehistoric materials have been returned to a culturally affiliated Tribe.

- The final report shall include evidence that all historic materials have been curated at a San Diego curation facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

5(c) The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

5(d) A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources (marginal rating). Proposed grading would include more than 2,500 cubic yards of excavation which has the potential to impact fossil deposits.

Accordingly, grading monitoring under the supervision of a standard monitor will be required. A standard monitor is a person who is on the project site during all original cutting of undisturbed substratum. The Standard Monitor must be designated by the Applicant and given the responsibility of watching for fossils so that the project is in conformance with Section 87.430 of the Grading Ordinance.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: grading monitoring under the supervision of a Standard Monitor and conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul-3.1.

5(e) Based on an analysis of records and archaeological surveys of the property, it has been determined that the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:			
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

6(a)(i) The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault.

6(a)(ii) To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.

6(a)(iii) The project site is not within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain.

6(a)(iv) The site is located within a “Landslide Susceptibility Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the Multi Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than

15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. The project site contains less than 25% slope and does not show evidence of previous landslides. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from adverse effects of landslides.

- 6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Greenfield sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes and Huerhuero loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes, eroded that has a soil erodibility rating of severe. However, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, would not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.
- 6(c) The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project.
- 6(d) The project is underlain by Greenfield sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes and Huerhuero loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes, which are considered to be an expansive soil as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). However, the project will not result in a significant impact because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.
- 6(e) The project would rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from geology/soils; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Would the Project:			
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 7(a) A GHG analysis was conducted for the proposed project and is included in the Global Climate Change Analysis dated 3/23/15. The analysis was conducted according to San Diego County Recommended Approach for Addressing Climate Change (2015).

The project proposed the development of 24 single family residential units. The project would generate GHG emissions from construction activities, operational vehicle trips, and indirect emissions from waste generation and electricity demand.

The San Diego County Recommended Approach for Addressing Climate Change (2015) uses screening levels for determining the need for additional analysis. Screening levels are recommended based on various land use densities and project types. Projects that meet or fall below the screening thresholds are expected to result in 900 MT/year of GHG emissions or less and would not require additional analysis. The 50 unit standard for single-family residential land use would apply to the proposed project. The project proposes the development of 24 single-family residential units, and therefore would fall below the screening criteria of 50 units. For projects of this size, it is presumed that the construction and operational GHG emissions would not exceed 900 MT CO₂e per year, and there would be a less-than cumulatively considerable impact. Further, emissions modeling was conducted for the project and project-generated GHG emissions are anticipated to be 504.5 MT CO₂e/year.

7(b) As described above, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. As such, the project would be consistent with County goals and policies included in the County General Plan that address greenhouse gas reductions. Therefore, the project would be consistent with emissions reduction targets of Assembly Bill 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act. Thus, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gas emissions.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to greenhouse gas emissions; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

public or the environment?

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

Discussion

8(a) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, The project site contains a residence and workshop/warehouse on site. Due to the age of these structures and the potential for asbestos and/or lead to have been present in construction materials, the completion of lead and/or asbestos surveys will be required as a condition in the final Decision.

8(b) The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

8(c) Based on a site visit and a comprehensive review of regulatory databases, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted on October 4, 2013 by Rincon Consultants, Inc. and the Limited Phase II ESA, dated November 7, 2013 were prepared for the project. Land uses on the 14.2-acre property historically consisted of agricultural uses. The Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment included field sampling of surficial soils from seven locations, at depths of six inches below ground surface (bgs) to one to two feet bgs on the property. The locations of the soil sample borings were chosen to represent general areas of potential collection and mixing of pesticides. Although several samples reported OCP concentrations above the laboratory detection limits, none were at or above their respective California Human Health Screening Level (CHHSLs). The Phase II findings concluded that there is no human health exposure concern on the subject property. Additionally, the project does not propose structures

for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.

- 8(d) The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport.
- 8(e) The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip.
- 8(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.
- 8(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.
- 8(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project is not located along the coastal zone.
- 8(f)(iv) EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN: The project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.
- 8f)(v) DAM EVACUATION PLAN: The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.
- 6(g) The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code, as described in the approved Fire Protection Plan prepared for the project by Dudek, (March 2015). Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter dated April 22, 2014 has been received from the Vista Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be three minutes which is within the five minute maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element.
- 6(h) The project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by County staff, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hazards/hazardous materials; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:			
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?
- l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Discussion

- 9(a) The project will require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).
- 9(b) The project lies in the Buena (904.32) hydrologic subarea, within the Carlsbad hydrologic unit. The project is in proximity to Buena Creek and Agua Hedionda Creek which are listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list. The project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) The project is a Tentative Map for residences which will involve temporary grading operations. The project will not use any groundwater as it relates to grading activities. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- 9(e) As outlined in the project’s SWMP, the project will implement source control and/or treatment control BMP’s to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.
- 9(f) The project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons: The project will not alter the natural drainage patterns and will have facilities to mitigate any increase in flowrate associated with the development.
- 9(g) The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

- 9(h) The project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.
- 9(i) No housing will be placed within a FEMA mapped floodplain or County-mapped floodplain or drainage with a watershed greater than 25 acres.
- 9(j) The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.
- 9(k) The project does not propose to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving any flooding.
- 9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(m)(i) SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.
- 9(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.
- 9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hydrology/water quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
10. Land Use and Planning – Would the Project:			
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 10(a) The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area.
- 10(b) The project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to land use/planning; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
11. Mineral Resources – Would the Project:			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11(a) The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as MRZ-3. However, the project site is surrounded by residential development which is incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.			
11(b) The project site is not located in an Extractive Use Zone (S-82), nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25).			

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to mineral resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
12. Noise – Would the Project:			
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Discussion

12(a) 12(a) The project is a Tentative Map for a residential subdivision. Incorporation of noise barriers screening future traffic along nearby roadways would ensure the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the General Plan, Noise Ordinance, or other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires projects to comply with a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Projects which could produce noise in excess of 60 dB(A) are required to incorporate design measures or mitigation as necessary to comply with the Noise Element.

The project is comprised of a Tentative Map subdivision located in the North County Metro Subregional Plan area immediately abutting Buena Creek Road. The project is subject to the County Noise Element which requires proposed exterior noise sensitive land uses not to exceed the 60 dBA CNEL noise requirement for single family residences. Noise levels from future traffic traveling on Buena Creek Road were evaluated and determined that future traffic level noise levels would be 60 dBA CNEL below on the ground level elevation of Lots closest to Buena Creek Road. Proposed lots closest to Buena Creek Road with second story receptors would be exposed to levels over 60 dBA CNEL. Staff requires a Noise Restriction Easement dedication 400 feet from the Buena Creek Road centerline. This would ensure exterior and interior noise levels requirement continue to conform to County Noise Element. Off-site direct and cumulative noise impacts to off-site residences was also evaluated and determined that project related traffic on nearby roadways would not have a direct noise impact of 3 dBA or more and would not have a significant contributions to the cumulative noise in the area. Direct and cumulative noise impacts to off-site existing residences would not occur. Therefore, incorporation of an Noise Restriction Easement, the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of 60 dB(A).

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404: Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project’s property line. The project does not involve any permanent noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-409: The project is subject to temporary construction noise as it relates to the County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.409. Grading equipment operations would be spread out over the project site from varying distances in relation to

occupied property lines. No blasting or rock crushing is anticipated during the grading operations. General grading operations would be spread out over the project site from distances near the occupied property to distances of 400-feet or more away. Based upon the proposed project, the majority of the grading operations will occur more than 100-feet from the southern and eastern property lines with the exception of the minor grading needed for water quality basins near Lone Oak Lane and Lone Oak Road. At distances of more than 90-feet the grading activities are anticipated not to exceed the County's 75-dBA standard and no mitigation measures are required.

- 12(b) The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the facilities are typically setback more than 50 feet from any County Circulation Element (CE) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 38 VdB or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities would insure that these proposed uses or operations do not have any chance of being impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment 1995, Rudy Hendriks, Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations 2002). This setback insures that this project site will not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

- 12(c) The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Additional vehicular traffic on nearby roadways and activities associated with residential subdivisions. As indicated in the response listed under Section 12(a), the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of any applicable noise standards. Off-site direct and cumulative noise impacts to off-site residences was also evaluated and determined that project related traffic on nearby roadways would not have a direct noise impact of 3 dBA or more and would not have a significant contributions to the cumulative noise in the area. Direct and cumulative noise impacts to off-site existing residences are not anticipated. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels.

- 12(d) The project is subject to temporary construction noise as it relates to the County Noise Ordinance, Section 36.409. Grading equipment operations would be spread out over the project site from varying distances in relation to occupied property lines. No blasting or rock crushing is anticipated during the grading operations. General grading operations would be spread out over the project site from distances near the occupied property to distances of 400-feet or more away. Based upon the proposed project, the majority of the grading operations will occur more than 100-feet from the southern and eastern property lines with the exception of the minor grading needed for water quality basins

near Lone Oak Lane and Lone Oak Road. At distances of more than 90-feet the grading activities are anticipated not to exceed the County’s 75-dBA standard and no mitigation measures are required.

12(e) The project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

12(f) The project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts from noise with the incorporation of a Noise Restriction Easement dedication as recommended within the acoustical analysis. This is considered a feasible mitigation measure as contained within the GPU EIR which will be applied to the project; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

13. Population and Housing – Would the Project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion

13(a) The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area.

13(b) The project will not displace a substantial number of existing housing units. The project will only remove one existing single family dwelling.

13(c) The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site only contains one single-family dwelling.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to populations/housing; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	---	--

14. Public Services – Would the Project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion

14(a) Based on the project’s service availability forms, the project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to public services; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
---	---	--

15. Recreation – Would the Project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion

15(a) The project would incrementally increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities; however, the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance.

15(b) The project includes one private internal trail. Impacts from this amenity has been considered as part of the overall environmental analysis contained elsewhere in this document.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to recreation; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
16. Transportation and Traffic – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 16(a) The project will result in an additional 240 ADT. Those project trips have been analyzed in a traffic study dated February, 2015. No direct impacts were identified. The project will construct intersection improvements on Lone Oak Road at the intersection with Buena Creek Road. The project will not conflict with any established performance measures. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. The project would participate in the Transportation Impact Fee Program to mitigate potential cumulative impacts.
- 16(b) The project proposes an additional 240 ADT, therefore the project does not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region’s Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG.
- 16(c) The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport.

- 16(d) The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.
- 16(e) The Vista Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project and its Fire Protection Plan and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.
- 16(f) The project will not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to transportation/traffic; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
17. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project:			
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- 17(a) The project would discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project facility availability form has been received from the Buena Sanitation District that indicates that there is adequate capacity to serve the project.
- 17(b) The project involves new water and wastewater pipeline extensions. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(c) The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(d) A Service Availability Letter from the Vista Irrigation District has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.
- 17(e) A Service Availability Letter from the Buena Sanitation District has been provided, which indicates that there is adequate wastewater capacity to serve the project.
- 17(f) All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the project.
- 17(g) The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility.

Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to utilities and service systems; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Attachments:

Appendix A – References

Appendix B – Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067

Appendix A

The following is a list of project specific technical studies used to support the analysis of each potential environmental effect:

Dudek, Shawn Shamlou (April, 2015). Agricultural Resources Report for the Lone Oak Road Project

LDN Consulting, Inc., Jeremy Loudon (August 27, 2015). Air Quality Assessment Lone Oak Ranch Residential Development.

Dudek, Anita Hayworth (February 2015). Biological Resources Project Report for the Lone Oak Road Project.

Dudek, Brad Comeau and Micah Hale (October 2014). Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Lone Oak Road Project, San Diego County, California.

Hunsaker & Associates San Diego, Inc., Alisa S. Bialpando (October 8, 2014). Tentative Map Drainage Study for Lone Oak Ranch.

Dudek, Michael Huff (March 2013) Fire Protection Plan Lone Oak Road Project

LDN Consulting, Inc., Jeremy Loudon (March 23, 2015). Global Climate Change Lone Oak Ranch Residential Development

Hunsaker & Associates, Dan Rehm (June 2015), Lone Oak Ranch Consistency Analysis

Rincon Consultants, Inc., Julie Marshall and Walt Hamann (October 4, 2013). Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

Rincon Consultants, Inc, Carly Gagen-Chenney and Walt Hammann (November 7, 2013). Phase II Environmental Site Assessment.

Hunsaker & Associates San Diego, Inc., Alisa S. Bialpando (February 2, 2015). Major Stormwater Management Plan for Lone Oak Ranch.

KOA Corporation Planning & Engineering (February 2, 2015). Lone Oak Ranch Traffic Impact Study

LDN Consulting, Inc., Jeremy Loudon (August 19, 2015), Preliminary Noise Study Lone Oak Ranch Residential Development

For a complete list of technical studies, references, and significance guidelines used to support the analysis of the General Plan Update Final Certified Program EIR, dated August 3, 2011, please visit the County's website at:

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00 -
_References_2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00_-_References_2011.pdf)

Appendix B

A Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067 is available on the Planning and Development Services website at:

http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf